

VU Research Portal

Literary Mystification: Hermeneutical Questions of the Early Dialectical Theology

Tolstoj, E.V.

published in

Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie
2012

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.1515/NZSTh-2012-0012](https://doi.org/10.1515/NZSTh-2012-0012)

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Tolstoj, E. V. (2012). Literary Mystification: Hermeneutical Questions of the Early Dialectical Theology. *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie*, 54(3), 312-331.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/NZSTh-2012-0012>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Katya Tolstaya

Literary Mystification: Hermeneutical Questions of the Early Dialectical Theology

Summary: This contribution addresses some hermeneutical problems related to Karl Barth's *Römerbrief* II. First, it surveys the role of the unpublished archive materials from the Karl Barth-Archiv, i.e. the commentaries, text additions and corrections Eduard Thurneysen sent to Barth during his work on *Römerbrief* II. Second, because Barth and Thurneysen allude to a literary character from Dostoevsky, Ivan Karamazov, the problem of an appropriation of literature in theology is discussed. These hermeneutic problems have a deeper theological ground, exemplified in Thurneysen's proposal for an extensive insertion in Barth's commentary on Rom. 8:18, which was entirely adopted by Barth and thus came to function as an integral part of Barth's commentary on Rom. 8:17–18. An appendix lists the extant documents of Thurneysen's intensive occupation with *Römerbrief* II (commentaries on Barth's manuscript, the galley and paper proofs). These documents are relevant for the genesis and chronology of *Römerbrief* II and yield important new insights into social, political and intellectual aspects of the Umwelt of early dialectical theology.

Zusammenfassung: Dieser Beitrag behandelt einige hermeneutische Probleme in Bezug auf Karl Barths *Römerbrief* II. Erstens werden äußerst wichtige unpublizierte Archivmaterialien aus dem Karl Barth-Archiv vorgestellt, nämlich die Kommentare, Textergänzungen und Korrekturen, welche Eduard Thurneysen während der Neubearbeitung des *Römerbriefs* an Barth schickte. Sie dokumentieren die intensive Mitarbeit Thurneysens an der Neufassung auf eindruckliche Weise. Zweitens wird dargestellt, dass Barth und Thurneysen in ihren Schriften beide vielfach auf literarische Gestalten verweisen, etwa auf eine Gestalt aus einem Dostojewski-Roman, Iwan Karamazow, wobei sich das hermeneutische Problem theologischer Zueignung von Literatur erhebt. Diese hermeneutischen Fragen haben einen tieferen theologischen Grund. Sie werden exemplarisch dargestellt anhand einer Ergänzung Thurneysens für Röm 8:18, welche Barth wörtlich in seinem Kommentar übernimmt, womit Thurneysens Text eine Einheit mit Barths Text bildet. Als Appendix wird eine Liste aller relevanten überlieferten Dokumente Thurneysens gegeben (Kommentare zu Barths Manuskript, zu den Druck- und Revisionsbögen). Diese Dokumente sind bedeutsam für die Genese und Chronologie von *Römerbrief* II, sowie für eine genauere Einsicht in

die sozialen, politischen und intellektuellen Aspekte der Umwelt der frühen Dialektischen Theologie.

Katya Tolstaya: Director Institute for Academic Study of Eastern Christianity (INaSEC), Assistant Professor of Dogmatics and Ecumenics, Faculty of Theology VU University Amsterdam, Office: Room 14-A18, De Boelelaan 1105, NL-1081 HV Amsterdam, e.v.tolstoj@vu.nl

1.1 Römerbrief II as a Literary Mystification

In the preface to *Römerbrief* II, Karl Barth challenges the scholars while expressing his gratitude to Eduard Thurneysen for his assistance with his book:

Eduard Thurneysen [...] hat aber auch das ganze im Entstehen begriffene Manuskript gelesen, begutachtet, und sich durch Einschaltung zahlreicher vertiefender, erläuternder und verschärfender Korollarien, die ich meist fast unverändert übernommen habe, in sehr selbstloser Weise ein verborgenes Denkmal gesetzt. Kein Spezialist wird dahinter kommen, wo in unserer auch hier bewährten Arbeitsgemeinschaft die Gedanken des einen anfangen, die des andern aufhören. (*RII*, 24)¹

Although Barth probably aimed his challenge not only at his contemporaries, but also towards the future, it is noteworthy that until now no one seems to have taken up the gauntlet.²

The reason for this form of the *Römerbrief* is, perhaps, hidden in the hermeneutical sphere, in what Barth, only a month after Thurneysen started to read and comment on the new *Römerbrief*, calls their “unusual literary habits”.³ For

¹ Karl BARTH, *Der Römerbrief (Zweite Fassung) 1922*, ed. by Cornelis van der Kooij/Katja TOLSTAJA, GA II (Zürich: TVZ, 2010 [henceforth *Römerbrief* II, or *RII*]), 24. See 6–8.

² Cf. e.g. the description in *TRE*: “Auch wenn Karl Barth 1921 im Vorwort zur 2. Auflage seines Römerbriefes prognostizierte, daß später kein Spezialist dahinterkommen werde, ‘wo in unserer auch hier bewährten Arbeitsgemeinschaft die Gedanken des einen anfangen, die des andern aufhören’ [...] und Thurneysens Einfluß auf Karl Barth nicht unterschätzt werden darf, liegt seine [Thurneysens] entscheidende Wirkung doch im Bereich der Praktischen Theologie [...]” Klaus RASCHZOK, Art. “Thurneysen, Eduard,” in *TRE* 33 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2002), 524–527, here: 526. Although without further interest, this is an exceptional example of acknowledgement of Thurneysen’s contribution to *Römerbrief* II, which has usually been academically ignored.

³ Barth sent the first *Römerbrief* II-text to Thurneysen on 28-10-1920 (*BW*), 435–436, on 28-10-1920 Thurneysen offers to read and to comment on the manuscript, see Karl BARTH/Eduard THURNEYSEN, *Briefwechsel* [henceforth *BW*], *Band 1: 1913–1921*, ed. by Eduard THURNEYSEN,

already on 26 November 1920 Barth writes that Thurneysen's contribution actually should be mentioned in the preface. He is already thinking of future theological-historical investigations into his book: "Wenn wir nicht so von allem Gewohnten abweichende literarische Gepflogenheiten hätten, so hättest du dir bereits eine Ehrenmeldung im Vorwort verdient durch deine Mitarbeit."⁴ Obviously, Thurneysen's contribution could not stay unmentioned in the "Preface" after the completion of *Römerbrief* II.

The extent of Thurneysen's contribution can be traced in their correspondence. However, in his edition of their correspondence, *BW*, Thurneysen erased these often extensive traces, probably on the same hermeneutical grounds and most likely also due to Thurneysen's modesty.⁵

From the seventy-two letters and comments Thurneysen wrote during the period of the revision of *Römerbrief*, only twenty-six letters have been published in *BWI*.⁶ All the passages concerning Thurneysen's actual share in the genesis of Barth's text have been left out.⁷ Of course, the conceptions of copyright and intellectual heritage have drastically changed since the two friends worked on the *Römerbrief*. From the perspective of modern literary theory, this hermeneutical situation makes the actual *Römerbrief* II-text bear aspects of a literary mystification with regard to Thurneysen's share in this project.

According to Julia Luisa Abramson, "[a] successful literary mystification consists of two principal elements that combine in concert. First, an author deploys rhetorical procedures to create a text that mimics a recognized form, causing the reader to mistake the text for an authentic exemplar of that form."⁸

GA V (Zürich: TVZ, 1973), 437–438 (with omissions). His last comments date 30-09-1921, followed until December by his comments on the galley proofs and the "Preface".

⁴ *BW*, 445; cf. idem, 472 and 509.

⁵ Thurneysen's letters to Barth are pervaded with modesty, e.g.: "Dein Brief hat [auch] mich ermuntert [auf meinem Weglein]." 28–10-1920, Karl Barth-Archiv [henceforth KBA]; the words in [] have been left out in *BWI*, 437. Cf. the impression of E. Busch: "Er [Thurneysen] ist echt bescheiden und sanfter als Barth." Eberhard Busch, *Meine Zeit mit Karl Barth: Tagebuch 1965–1968* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 16.

⁶ See our paragraph "Wo die Gedanken des einen anfangen, die des andern aufhören". Thurneysen's Bemerkungen zur zweiten Römerbriefauslegung," in *RII*, XXXIII–XXXVI.

⁷ Within the scope of our *Römerbrief* II-project I have digitalized all of Thurneysen's seventy-two documents and prepared them for publication, which is clearly a desideratum.

⁸ Julia Luisa ABRAMSON, *Learning From Lying: Paradoxes of the Literary Mystification* (Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 2005²), 13. Evidently, one such definition cannot cover all possible varieties of mystification, but it may stir reflection on a specific case. A similar question goes for *Father Arseny*, a mystification of a Russian-Orthodox hagiography. On this case see Katya TOLSTAYA/PETER VERSTEEG, "Inventing a Saint: Religious Fiction in Post-Communist Russia", forthcoming.

Barth's statement that no one will be able to distinguish where the thought of the one begins and the thought of the other ends can be seen as evidence for deliberate equalization of Thurneysen's additions to *Römerbrief* II. Thurneysen wrote his comments more or less 'mimicking' Barth's idiom and style, evidently driven by (indeed) their unity of thought. But as Barth often inserted Thurneysen's comments verbatim, a sort of mystification was created. In this case, however, it does not cause a mistaking on the part of the reader, rather the challenge to discern who wrote what (precisely because they felt *Römerbrief* II to be part of a broader joint campaign). Some of this 'Barthian' idiom entered Thurneysen's own writing as well, as may be evinced from his *Dostojewski*, written during the revision of *Römerbrief* II. Apparently, it had been an issue of discussion in Barth's family circle. Thurneysen reflects on Barth's influence on him: "Auch in meinem Ausruf, ich möchte 'es' so sagen können wie Du lag wirklich kein Griff nach Deinen Prägungen. Ich verstehe Nellys [Barth's wife] Befürchtungen schon, es könnte etwas lächerlich werden, wenn es so unisono von zweien gleichzeitig gesagt wird; ich weiss auch, dass Dein Stil auf mich einwirkt und will wachsam sein." [Letter Thurneysen-Barth 21-03-1921, KBA] The second criterion to meet Abramson's definition of literary mystification is that "the use of ironic clues within the text achieves a distancing effect, causing the attentive reader to reevaluate the text and recognize the deception."⁹ Barth's quoted challenge in the preface caused at least this attentive reader to reevaluate *Römerbrief* II. Of course, contemporary readers did not have the correspondence available which, at least in part, allows us not so much to recognize the deception, but to distinguish the authors. In a way, Thurneysen's editing of *BW* only added to the mystification, again, partly out of modesty. So I now ask: concretely with what did Thurneysen establish for himself "in sehr selbstloser Weise ein verborgenes Denkmal"?

1.2 Thurneysen's documents listed

There are seventy-two documents from the period of the revision of *Römerbrief* II. Although all these documents are relevant for this period of rewriting of the *Römerbrief* (e.g. for its genesis, chronology, or for social, political and intellectual aspects and *Umwelt* of early dialectical theology), the list of the documents (given as an appendix below) specifies only the direct references to the text of Barth's *Römerbrief*. It is not clear exactly which and how much of Thurneysen's

⁹ Ibid.

comments are lost. His letters give the impression that he began to elaborate increasingly extensively as Barth's work progressed, so it cannot be stated with certainty that some comments up to Rom. 5 would be missing in the KBA. I can only presume the lacunae regarding Rom. 6:12–23; 9:1–13 and in most of the proofs.¹⁰ One problem with establishing the exact genesis of *Römerbrief* II is that Barth and Thurneysen worked on three textual corpora simultaneously: manuscript, galley proofs and page proofs. It is very difficult to detect how much has been lost, and more interesting anyway is what has been preserved.

As Thurneysen's preserved comments on the proofs show, there should be substantial text insertions made from the lost proofs as well. Without these lost data, no fully adequate assessment of Thurneysen's contribution to *Römerbrief* II can be made. One thing is clear: it was not scant. The collaboration between the two friends is of interest in terms of history of theology, hermeneutics, textual genesis, but most important – it directly affected the theology of *Römerbrief* II.

There is also one particular theme relevant for Barth's project which Barth also indicates as having been influenced by Thurneysen. This will be discussed below.

II.1 Dostoevsky in *Römerbrief* II

In the "Preface" to *Römerbrief* II Barth mentions four factors which determined the revision of his book. The third of them is a deeper insight into the thought of Plato and Kant, and into the importance of Kierkegaard and Dostoevsky for an understanding of the New Testament (RII, 7). Barth expresses his indebtedness to Thurneysen's study on Dostoevsky, which appeared in the summer of 1921.¹¹ In the following I will elaborate on the theme of the allusions to the Russian writer in *Römerbrief* II.

In *Römerbrief* I there is not a single mention of the writer. *Römerbrief* II contains thirty-two references to Dostoevsky, who thus takes a notable place among the thinkers, theologians, artists and literary figures Barth refers to. Of the thirty-two references, twenty-nine explicitly mention Dostoevsky or one of his characters.¹² In his discussion of Rom. 2:14–19 Barth alludes to the title *Crime and Punishment* (*Schuld und Sühne*, RII, 101). Once he actually resumes his ana-

¹⁰ The last stages of preparing Thurneysen's documents for publication might shed some light on this.

¹¹ Eduard THURNEISEN, *Dostojewski* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1921, *idem*, 1922³).

¹² RII 7, 99, 100, 164, 170, 194, 256, 304, 319, 328, 346, 347, 379, 401, 411, 415, 455, 482, 485, 527, 528, 530–531, 577, 642, 643, 669–670 (twice), 674, 691.

lysis of Ivan Karamazov's rejection of the eternal harmony which he treated earlier in this chapter (RII, 417–418); once, and without an explicit source reference, Barth uses an image of the “parallel lines” Ivan Karamazov appeals to in order to substantiate his rebellion against any reconciliation in eternity (RII, 411),¹³ once the election of the Russian people is mentioned in debate with the author (RII, 304). However, it is not the frequency of references to Dostoevsky which is decisive, but their function in Barth's theological context.

II.2 “What's in a name?”

So, “what's in a name”? Why Barth's interest in Dostoevsky? It was primarily the *Zeitgeist*. Barth and Thurneysen were not unique in their interest in the writer. By 1920 Dostoevsky's name had become established among intellectuals throughout Europe. In Germany it was mainly due to the publication of Dostoevsky's *Sämtliche Werke*, which started in 1906. The project was initiated by the conservative revolutionary Arthur Moeller van den Bruck in close collaboration with the famous Russian religious thinker and writer D.S. Merezhkovsky. Both wrote introductions to the separate volumes. In these prefaces they presented Dostoevsky as a kind of modern-day prophet.¹⁴

In the shadow of the First World War and of the Russian Revolution the Western general public started, indeed, to see Dostoevsky as a kind of prophet. Many saw in his novels a prediction of the crisis in the West, or even an answer to the questions of their disrupted time. Rilke, Kafka, Freud, Musil, Zweig, Tho-

¹³ In 1826 the Russian mathematician Lobachevskii proved that two parallel lines cross in infinity, in contrast to what had always been assumed in Euclidean geometry. Dostoevsky incorporated this discovery in Ivan Karamazov's rebellion against God in *The Brothers Karamazov*. See F.M. DOSTOEVSKY, *Полное собрание сочинений в тридцати томах*, [Complete collected works in thirty volumes], V.G. BAZANOV et al. (ed.) (Leningrad: “Nauka”, 1972–1990, henceforth: PSS), XIV, 214. He also ponders these new mathematical theories in the *Notebook* (1880–1881), probably written in connection with the non-Euclidean geometry of Georg Riemann. See PSS XXVII, 43, cf. 324.

¹⁴ See Christoph GARSTKA, *Arthur Moeller van den Bruck und die erste deutsche Gesamtausgabe der Werke Dostojewski's im Piper-Verlag 1906–1919. Eine Bestandsaufnahme sämtlicher Vorbemerkungen und Einführungen von Arthur Moeller van den Bruck und Dmitrij S. Mereschkovskij unter Nutzung unveröffentlichter Briefe der Übersetzerin E.K. Rahsin*, (Frankfurt am Main (u.a.): Heidelberger Publikationen zur Slavistik. B. Literaturwissenschaftliche Reihe, 1998); Alexander KRASSNOV, “Ständig gegen den Westen protestierend. Gemeinsamkeiten von ‘konservativen Revolutionären’ in Deutschland und russischen Slawophilen”, in *Deutsche Stimme* 4 (Mai 2004), 7.

mas and Heinrich Mann, Hesse along with many other German-speaking writers absorbed Dostoevsky's novels in their work. H.-G. Gadamer remembers: "Die roten Piper-Bände der Dostojewskischen Romane flammten auf jedem Schreibtisch".¹⁵ Barth and Thurneysen read Dostoevsky in the *Sämtliche Werke*, but occasionally quote from the 25-volume *Insel-Ausgabe*, edited by Stefan Zweig, as well. Both felt attracted to the world of the novels and recognized kindred themes in them.

II.3 F.M. Dostoevsky in the Correspondence Between Barth and Thurneysen

Who led whom to Dostoevsky: did Barth lead Thurneysen, or Thurneysen Barth? The first novel by Dostoevsky mentioned in the correspondence is *Crime and Punishment*. In a letter to Thurneysen on the 18th of August 1915, Barth confesses that, having read *Crime and Punishment*, he wished *really* to understand "these Russians".¹⁶ And then the Russian writer is left unmentioned for some years.

¹⁵ Hans-Georg Gadamer, "Selbstdarstellung," in: Grondin, Jean (ed.), *Gadamer Lesebuch* (Tübingen, 1997), 1–30; hier: 4; cf. Hans-Georg Gadamer, "Martin Heidegger," in: *Neue Sammlung. Göttinger Blätter für Kultur und Erziehung*, 5. Jg. (1965), 1–9; hier: 3: "Dostojewskijs Romane wühlten uns auf. Die roten Piper-Bände leuchteten wie Flammenzeichen von jedem Schreibtisch." See also (quoted in): GERIGK, Horst-Jürgen, "Dostojewski's Wirkung im deutschen Sprachraum", in: DDG 8 (2001), 24–59, here: 26; Maike Schult, *Im Banne des Poeten. Die theologische Dostoevskij-Rezeption und ihr Literaturverständnis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 12. Cf. Pieter BOULOGNE, *Het temmen van de Scyth. De vroege Nederlandse receptie van F.M. Dostoevskij* (Amsterdam: Pegasus, 2011), 122–124.

¹⁶ "Gestern las ich den ganzen Tag Dostojewski 'Schuld und Sühne'; ich wollte ich würde *ganz* klug aus diesen Russen [aber dazu muss man wohl schon Dietschi heissen]." Cf. *BWL*, 72 (with omissions). (Max Dietschi (1873–1951), "excellent minister in Seon (Aargau)," thus *BWL*, 18; cf. Rudolf Bohren, *Prophetie und Seelsorge: Eduard Thurneysen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982) 69; 93.) Paul H. BRAZIER, *Barth and Dostoevsky. A Study of the Influence of the Russian Writer Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky on the Development of the Swiss theologian Karl Barth, 1915–1922* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2007), 31 bases the main thesis of his book, that Dostoevsky was already a crucial influence on Barth from 1915 – and thus not only for *Römerbrief II*, but also for *Römerbrief I* – on a careless reading of the quotation: "Yesterday I spent the entire day reading Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* – I wanted to become completely wise about this Russian." And he adds in a footnote after the German text of this quote: "Note the emphatic emphasis in the German never translated into English – *ganz klug*, wholly, whole, very, entirely wise!" Clearly Barth means here that he does not *really* understand the Russians ("diesen Russen" ("the Russians") is dative plural). He confirms his uncertainty in the ironic allusion to Dietschi. In Brazier's reading, Barth "wants to understand this Russian

The next reference to Dostoevsky in the correspondence is in April 1919. From that time Barth clearly turns to the writer again, and in the following three years Dostoevsky's name appears very frequently. Barth's understanding is now different. In a letter to Thurneysen from 20th July 1919 he writes of being glad not to read Dostoevsky, Nietzsche and Ibsen as a schoolboy anymore (BWI, 404). In the period following April 1919 he sees in Dostoevsky a kindred spirit. That means that in the novels he recognizes one of his own main themes: a depiction of the permanent crisis of human life in the face of God. Moreover, Barth refers to Dostoevsky in connection with almost all important themes. He recollects this time in his conversation at Princeton on the 2nd May 1962: "At that time I was under the influence of Plato, of Kant, of Dostoevsky, of Kierkegaard etc."¹⁷

The references to Dostoevsky from 1915 and 1919 suggest that the interest in Dostoevsky originated from Barth. Especially after Barth started to reread Dostoevsky in April 1919, he is the one to bring the writer to the fore (during the whole of 1919 and until October 1920). Thus, the correspondence gives a different impression than Barth himself, who on various occasions acknowledged his debt to Thurneysen regarding this matter. The first time he did so was in the "Preface" to *Römerbrief* II (RII, 7), and the last time in 1968, the final year of his life:

Thurneysen war es, der mir einmal unter vier Augen das Stichwort halblaut zuflüsterte: Was wir für Predigt, Unterricht und Seelsorge brauchten, sei eine "ganz andere" theologische Grundlegung. [...] wir hatten damals auch massenhaft Dostojewski (auch bei seiner Lektüre war Thurneysen führend) [...] gelesen.¹⁸

An equally pronounced indication of Thurneysen's initiative of concerning the theological turn to Dostoevsky can be found ten years earlier, in Barth's recollections of the paths of early dialectical theology on the occasion of Thurneysen's seventieth birthday:

completely". Later on Brazier paraphrases: "he was so impressed by *Crime and Punishment* that he then wanted to be as wise as this Russian." *Idem*, 75. The incorrect reading of the German and his unfamiliarity with the manuscript leads Brazier to the untenable conclusion: "Barth's comments [...] that he was profoundly struck by the wisdom of this Russian writer can be used to set parameters for this crucial early influence: August 1915 to August 1916"; *idem*, 87. Brazier ultimately extends this conclusion to Thurneysen: "This explains [...] why *Crime and Punishment* made such an impression on Barth and Thurneysen in 1915' (102; cf. 103); '[...] their study together of *Crime and Punishment* in 1915" (117).

¹⁷ Karl BARTH, *Gespräche 1959–1962*, GA IV/25, Eberhard BUSCH (Ed.) (Zürich: TVZ, 1995), 297. The quotation comes from Barth's conversation in Princeton I (2 May 1962).

¹⁸ Karl BARTH, "Nachwort", in: *Schleiermacher-Auswahl*, Heinz BOLLI (ed.) (München-Hamburg: Siebenstern, 1968), 290–312, here: 294–295; cf. Eberhard BUSCH, *Karl Barths Lebenslauf: nach seinen Briefen und autobiographischen Texten* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1975), 130.

Es war aber schon in unserem früheren Verkehr zwischen Leutwil und Safenwil [...], und es war auch 1921 bis 1925 nicht so, daß ich der Anregende bzw. Gebende, Thurneysen nur der Angeregte bzw. Empfangende war. Er war es vielmehr, der mich zuvor auf die Spur van Blumhardt und Kutter und dann auch auf die von Dostojewski geführt hatte, ohne deren Entdeckung ich weder den ersten noch den zweiten Römerbrief hätte schreiben können, sondern – wer weiß? – tatsächlich die lockende Laufbahn eines aargauischen Gewerkschaftsmannes und Großartes betreten hätte.¹⁹

However, the impression from the correspondence that it is mainly Barth who writes of Dostoevsky does not hold for the period of the rewriting of *Römerbrief II*. In his letter from October 14th 1920 Barth is the one to urge Thurneysen to deliver a lecture on Dostoevsky at the Students' conference in Aarau (see *BWI*, 434). Obviously, the roles are reversed after Thurneysen, on 28th October, responds and agrees to give the lecture (see *BWI*, 437, with omissions). From that moment, the correspondence too gives the impression that Thurneysen becomes the “expert” on Dostoevsky. He held his lecture to great acclaim on the 21st of April 1921, and published the adapted text later as a small book, entitled *Dostojewski*. Both friends were then familiar at least with three of Dostoevsky's great novels: *Crime and Punishment*, *The Idiot* and *The Brothers Karamazov*, along with a selection of his journalistic articles and his *Selected Letters*.

Parallel to his Dostoevsky-research, Thurneysen assisted with the revision of *Römerbrief II*. The fact that Thurneysen was actually working on two projects at the same time has left a clear trace in *Römerbrief II*. Barth used almost all of his suggestions, often literally, in the final text. From the thirty-two explicit allusions to Dostoevsky in *Römerbrief II*, six have certainly been adopted from Thurneysen. Given the loss of some Thurneysen's letters and commentaries, it is, however, impossible to reconstruct the history of all Dostoevsky-allusions in *Römerbrief II*.

¹⁹ Karl BARTH, “Lebendige Vergangenheit. Briefwechsel Barth-Thurneysen aus den Jahren 1921–1925”, in *Gottesdienst – Mendienst. Eduard Thurneysen zum 70. Geburtstag am 10. Juli 1958* (Basel: Zollikon, 1958), 7–173, here: 13–14. Besides the quotation from Barth's letter of 18 August 1915, one sentence from this quotation is the only other support for Brazier's thesis. He reads this sentence inaccurately too: the comma found in the original is lacking in his translation: ‘On the contrary he was the one who first put me on the trail of Blumhardt and Kutter, and then also Dostoevsky without whose discovery I would not have been able to write either the first or the second edition of the commentary on Romans.’ Cf. BRAZIER, *Barth and Dostoevsky* (see nt. 16), 75. Because there is a comma after Kutter and one has been left out between ‘Dostoevsky’ and ‘without whose’, Brazier takes it that ‘Blumhardt and Kutter’ have a separate position, and that the real subject is Dostoevsky without whom (‘whose’ would then have to be read as singular) Barth could not have written both commentaries. Cf. 80–81. However, I read the German in this way: Thurneysen put Barth on the trail of “Blumhardt and Kutter and then also”, that is to say, later, “Dostoevsky, without whose discovery (...)” – so first Blumhardt and Kutter for *Römerbrief I*, then Dostoevsky for *Römerbrief II*.

III.1 Hermeneutical Problems

In the following paragraphs I will define hermeneutics as a discipline engaged with relationships between a text, an image of the author (narrator), the author as a real person, characters, and the reader. Below I will discuss the following two hermeneutical problems:

- The functioning and appropriation of a foreign/borrowed text (in our case the texts of Thurneysen and Dostoevsky) in a new theological text;
- The functioning of a literary character (in our case, Ivan Karamazov) in a theological text.

The second hermeneutic-methodological aspect transfers the problems from the area of heuristics to that of theology and provides a basis for a critical comprehension of *Römerbrief II*.

III.2 Barth's Commentary on Rom. 8:17

The most important references to Dostoevsky in *Römerbrief II* can be found in Barth's commentary on Rom. 8:17 and 18, in which the theme of suffering and theodicy are discussed. In order to substantiate my point, the method of a close reading is required. For this reason, I offer here first a longer quotation from Barth's commentary on Rom. 8:17.

Menschenleid, Menschenschuld, Menschenschicksal, wie sie sich unaufhörlich finster offenbaren in dem höchst fragwürdigen Gesicht, in der höchst fragwürdigen Lebensgeschichte *jedes* Einzelnen, im Wahnsinn unsrer Städte und im Stumpfsinn unsrer Dörfer, in der banalen Gewalt unsrer primitivsten Lebensbedürfnisse und in der ideologischen Weltfremdheit unsres Wissens und Gewissens, in den Schrecken der Geburt und des Todes, in dem aus jedem Stein und aus jeder Baumrinde schreienden Rätsel der Natur und in der Ergebnislosigkeit der Kreisläufe der Weltgeschichte, in der Quadratur des Zirkels und in den beiden Parallelen, die sich im Endlichen nie schneiden – sie haben eine *Stimme*, sie haben ein *Licht*, wer das *einmal* gehört, *einmal* gesehen, und zwar existentiell, also *nicht* psychologisch, soziologisch, historisch, naturwissenschaftlich, in keinem Sinn vornehm, akademisch, überlegen, unbeteiligt, aber auch in keinem Sinn "fromm", "religiös abgeklärt", ganz und gar ohne die erschlichene Voraussetzung einer Vorsehung und Harmonie über diesem Ganzen, sondern: existentiell, will sagen ernsthaft, selber angebrannt, selber aus dem Sattel geworfen, unproblematisch, uninteressant, unausweichlich, unrettbar gehört und gesehen hat – gehört und gesehen mit den Ohren und Augen des Iwan Karamasoff! –, der fragt nicht mehr, sondern hört und sieht – was? Sich selber! Als "Glaubenden", "Liebenden", "Hoffenden"? Nein und tausendmal nein, sondern sich selber gegenüber dem *ganz* Unmöglichen, *absolut* Widersprechenden, *endgültig* nicht zu

Rechtfertigenden, *nie und nimmer* mit einem Gottesbegriff zu Krönenden. Sich selber gegenüber der Totalität des Seins und Geschehens als einen Andern, als Leidenden, als Unterliegenden, als antwortlos Fragenden, als machtlos Protestierenden und Rebellierenden, in der gänzlichen Unfähigkeit, etwas anderes zu tun als zu schreien oder – zu schweigen. Aber eben: sich selbst als einen *Andern*, letztlich allerletztlich, nein erstlich allererstlich *getrennt* von diesem Ganzen (von dem *er* sich doch gerade *nicht* trennen kann!), in ursprünglicher Freiheit und Überlegenheit diesem Ganzen gegenübergestellt (in das *er* doch restlos verflochten ist!), sich selber in der ganz und gar unbegreiflichen Lage, zu diesem Ganzen Nein zu sagen (das *er* doch mit seinem Protestieren und Rebellieren nur bejahen kann!). Sich selber als Gottes Kind! Denn was ist geschehen? In, mit und unter *diesem* Hören und Sehen ist offenbar das Schreien: Abba! Vater!, und wenn der Mensch den Namen Gottes noch nie gehört hätte und wenn er ihn gleichzeitig lästern würde. In, mit und unter diesem Entsetzen des Menschen vor sich selbst ist offenbar der neue Mensch, der Mensch einer neuen Welt geboren, die Theodizee vollzogen, neben der jede andre nur Spott und Hohn ist, hat Gott sich selbst vor uns gerechtfertigt und damit uns vor ihm. Redend mit *dieser* Stimme und leuchtend in *diesem* Licht hat Gott das Einmalige, Existentielle getan, hat den Menschen angenommen als sein Kind. (RII, 410–412)

Commenting on Paul's text and thereby introducing, as we shall see, Thurneysen's text into his text, and responding to the rebellion of Ivan Karamazov, Barth draws a theological conclusion: "Theodicy [has been] accomplished". How convincing is Barth in his assertion?

III.3 Allusions to Dostoevsky in Rom. 8:17–18 in the Barth-Thurneysen Correspondence

In a passage from his letter of 1st July 1921, omitted in *BWI*, Thurneysen discusses the commentary on 8:1–18. He does not comment on the above passage. The reference in Rom. 8:17 to Ivan Karamazov in relation to theodicy probably comes from Barth himself. Thurneysen does propose a long addition to Rom. 8:18 with a reference to Ivan Karamazov, so that the entire section Rom. 8:17–18 seems to have been elicited by Ivan's speech in the chapter "Rebellion" of *The Brothers Karamazov*. In the novel Ivan rejects the concept of eternal harmony because it is not worth one tear of an innocent child. Ivan is a collector of evidence supporting his rejection – real stories of suffering, mainly of children. The following is important: Ivan's problem is suffering, not theodicy. He knows that ultimately God will arrange everything in such a way that the human "Euclidean" theodicy will prove superfluous, and just because he knows this, he hastens with his riot while he is still alive.

The anecdotes told by Ivan are described on the basis of real events carefully gathered by Dostoevsky: “All the stories about the children occurred, took place, were printed in the newspapers, and I can show where. Nothing has been invented by me.” (Letter of 10 May 1879: PSS XXX₁, 64; CL²⁰ V, 83) Though Ivan wants to confine himself mainly to the plight of children, his rebellion is aimed against pointless suffering in creation as a whole. Dostoevsky explains the position of this character in the same letter: “My hero takes up a theme that *I think* irrefutable – the senselessness of the suffering of children – and derives from it the absurdity of all historical reality.” [PSS XXX₁, 63; CL V, 83] It is relevant to the discussion of Ivan’s rebellion in *Römerbrief* II that these concrete facts pose the following problem to (systematic) theology: the objectifying reflection on facts always fails in a certain sense to do justice to these facts.

Before discussing both passages (Rom. 8:17–18), I will sketch their genesis. Barth sent his commentary on Rom. 8 in three batches: on 30th May 1921 Rom. 8:1–10; on 13th June the ‘central part’ (the correspondence does not make it clear which) and on 20th June the final part (this is not specified either).²¹ Precisely in sending the second part, which one may assume to be the central part with the Dostoevsky references, Barth asks Thurneysen not to keep any of his criticism to himself: “Ich bin dir fortlaufend sehr dankbar für diese Streckeninspektors- oder auch Wagenkontrolleursarbeit (der Mann, der mit ernstem Gesicht mit einem Hammer an die Räder klopft auf den Bahnhöfen!).” (*BWI*, 494–495) In the letter of 24th June, of which only a small excerpt is printed in *BWI*, Thurneysen writes about the dispatch of this central part: “*Röm. 8!* Vielen Dank für die Übersendung und vorläufige Belehrung. Endgültige Durchsicht dieser Tage. Du erhältst es bestimmt nächste Woche zurück auf dass es weitergehe.” (*KBA*; cf. omission in: *BWI*, 498–499.) This illustrates not only how close their collaboration was, but also how Thurneysen tended to downplay this in *BW*.

On 20th June Barth asks whether the text is not too insubstantial compared with the first version, and requests Thurneysen to suggest improvements if necessary. (*BWI*, 497.) On 1st July Thurneysen in fact sends back Rom. 8:1–18 with a number of remarks. In this letter he expresses his admiration, and adds that the section will function for readers as a final chord to the preceding:

Da kommt nun das 8. Cap.[itel] zurück. Ohne dass ich auch nur an einer Stelle irgendwelche Wünsche wesentlicher Art hätte. Ich finde alles Satz für Satz, Glied um Glied

²⁰ CL: Fyodor DOSTOEVSKY, *Complete Letters*, edited and translated by David Lowe and Ronald Meyer. 5 volumes (Ann Arbor: Ardis Publishers, 1988–1991).

²¹ See *BWI*, 492; 494. Barth writes that completion of the third part means that “das gefährliche Couloir Kap. 5–8 zurückgelegt” (496).

bewundernswert im Senkel, dichtgefügt, kein Wort zu viel, eher etwa einige zu wenig, d.h. fast zu gedrängt alles, aber das ist alles andere eher als ein Vorwurf.²²

What has been left out without notification in *BWI* is that Thurneysen proposes a long addition in which he comments on the revision of his lecture for *Dostojewski*:

Ich kam frisch von Dostojewski her dahinter und war von eigenen Ritten (anlässlich Iwan Karamasoffs und vor allem auch des Staretzen, der in der neuen Fassung ganz anders berücksichtigt und dargestellt ist als ursprünglich) durch diese uns allmählich nicht mehr ganz unbekannten Gegenden und über diese immer wiederkehrenden dialektischen Hürden weg einigermaßen im Sattel, so weit jedenfalls, dass ich mit angespanntester Beteiligung und mit Bewunderung den Gängen Deines Renners folgte und dabei war, wie er Hindernis um Hindernis oft ganz glänzend nahm. Vorausgesetzt, dass man Dir durch die 7 vorhergehenden Felder gefolgt ist, wird man dieses 8. in keinem Punkte verweigern können. [...] Hier einige Anmerkungen. (*Letter Thurneysen-Barth*, 01-07-1921, KBA)

IV.1 Thurneysen's Letter from 1st July 1921 and Barth's Commentary on Rom. 8:18

In his letter of 4th July Barth thanks him for his remarks on Rom. 8: "Ich habe den langen Einschub, schwach verkürzt, doch aufgenommen mit nochmaligem Verweis auf Iwan Karamasoff. Er ist keineswegs überflüssig und störend." (*BWI*, 500) If we compare the passage from Thurneysen's contribution and the final text of *Römerbrief* II, it is in fact clear that Barth has cut almost nothing.

Thurneysen, Letter of 1 July 1921

/4/wäre nach: "tröstliche Deutung" einzuschieben: "etwa *durch den Hinweis auf eine das diesseitige Leiden ausgleichende, aufhebende Jenseitige Harmonie* kann es sich hier *jedenfalls* (statt 'offenbar', was erst zu begründen wäre) *nicht handeln*." Weiter nach dem darauf folgenden Satze: "Sie scheitert notorisch an ... eherne Wirklichkeit ist", wäre etwas wie eine Begründung dieser hier behaupteten Unmöglichkeit zu geben, auf irgend einen Schmerz des Menschen zu antworten mit einem Troste. Ich lege es mir etwa so /5/ zurecht: Denn hinter jedem kleinsten und erst recht hinter den grossen und grössten Schmerzen und Qualen

²² This reading follows the manuscript in KBA. All of Thurneysen's letters and comments concerning *RII* will be published separately, ed. by Katya TOLSTAYA (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

des Lebens steht brennend die ganze *unendliche* Problematik des Lebens selber; und mit was wollen wir ihr antworten? Sie ist ja die Voraussetzung unseres ganzen Daseins, von der wir immer schon herkommen, jede Antwort, die *wir* zu geben, jeder Trost, den *wir* versuchen wollten, käme zu kurz. Wir können unserer Endlichkeit und Beschränktheit nicht entrinnen auch nicht durch den Gedanken an eine unendliche, göttliche Harmonie jenseits dieser Zeit und Welt. Denn die Unendlichkeit, die *wir* allenfalls – auf der Flucht vor den Leiden dieser Zeit – uns zum Troste erdenken, ist doch nur unendlich *im Vergleich* zu unserer Endlichkeit, setzt diese also wieder voraus, ist die Fata Morgana unserer Wüstenwanderung. *Der* Gott, den *wir* allenfalls Vergeltung und Ausgleich üben lassen in einem Jenseits ist Nicht-Gott dieser Welt, und seine Harmonie ist nur relativ zu unserer Disharmonie. Die unendliche Problematik unserer Endlichkeit aber schreit nach einer nicht relativen, sondern absoluten, unser Denken völlig übersteigenden Lösung, nach dem wirklichen, dem unbekannten Gotte, nach einem Troste, dem gegenüber die Leiden dieser Zeit nicht mehr ins /6/ Gewicht fallen, weil *dieser* Trost auf einem völlig andern Felde liegt, weil das “dort” unvergleichbar anders ist als alles “hier”. Darum muss unser Trost finden, damit anfangen, dass wir einsehen ... Hier münden meine Zwischengedanken, die natürlich in der vorgebrachten Formulierung so nicht brauchbar sind, wieder in Deinem Contexte. Unter Umständen wären hier Zitate aus Iwan Karamasoff zu verwenden. Ich habe das Buch nicht zur Hand, kann Dir aber morgen die betr. Satze noch nachsenden. [...] Bei nochmaligem Überprüfen des zu-/7/letzt Bemerkten sehe ich ein, dass es wohl besser ist, Du lässtest Dich dadurch zu keiner Einschaltung verführen. [...] Also nimm meine Zwischengedanken als Einfälle Deines ersten Lesers mehr denn als wirklich zu erwägende Einschübe.

Rom. 8:18 [RII, 414–416]

Wir haben uns Rechenschaft zu geben über den Sinn dieser wahrhaft ungeheuerlichen Betrachtungsweise der menschlichen Dinge. Um irgend eine überschwengliche Vertiefung oder Überhöhung der gewöhnlichen Betrachtungsweise, um irgend eine immanente Ignorierung, Abschwächung oder tröstliche Deutung des Leidens (etwa durch den Hinweis auf eine das “diesseitige” Leiden ausgleichende bzw. aufwiegende “jenseitige” Harmonie) kann es sich hier jedenfalls nicht handeln. Sie scheitert notorisch an jedem Zahnweh, geschweige denn an jedem ernsthaften Ausblick auf das, was als Geburt, Krankheit und Tod, als Hunger und Krieg, als Menschen- und Völkerschicksal in jedem Augenblick in der ganzen Breite menschlichen Geschehens brutale eherne Wirklichkeit ist.

Denn hinter jedem kleinsten Weh und erst recht hinter den großen Qualen unsres Lebens steht brennend die Problematik seiner Endlichkeit. Wie sollen wir *ihr* begegnen? Kurzschlüssig und lügnerisch ist jeder Trost, jede Antwort, die *wir* zu geben versuchen, denn *wir* sind es, die von jener Problematik *herkommen* und die *ihr* nicht entrinnen werden, auch nicht durch den Gedanken an eine unendliche göttliche Harmonie jenseits unsrer Welt. Denn Unendlichkeit, die *wir* uns allenfalls zu erdenken vermögen, ist gemessen an unsrer Endlichkeit und also selber nur unendliche – Endlichkeit. Die Harmonie, die *wir* postulieren, ist relativ zu unsrer Disharmonie, ist die Fata Morgana unsrer Wüstenwanderung. Und der Gott, den *wir* Vergeltung und Ausgleich üben lassen in einem “bessern” Jenseits, ist Nicht-Gott, der Gott dieser Welt, geschaffen nach des Menschen Bild und so auch des Menschen Kritik, ja Leugnung nicht entzogen, wenn ihm etwa ein Iwan Karamasoff begegnen sollte. Die Problematik unserer Endlichkeit aber schreit nach einer nicht relativen, sondern absoluten, *unser* Denken übersteigenden Lösung, sie schreit nach dem wirklichen, dem unbekannten Gotte, nach *seinem* Troste, demgegenüber die Leiden dieser Zeit darum “nicht ins Gewicht fallen”, weil *sein* Trost das allem Hier inkommensurabel gegenüberstehende Dort ist. Trost finden muss also damit anfangen, dass wir einsehen: *wir* haben *keinen* Trost, und Trost geben damit, dass wir bekennen: *wir* sind allzumal *leidige* Tröster.

Of Dostoevsky's entire *oeuvre*, Ivan's rebellion against God and his narrative about the Grand Inquisitor take pride of place in Thurneysen's *Dostojewski* and in *Römerbrief* II. In his *Dostojewski* Thurneysen does not connect Ivan's 'atheism' with the world-view of Starets Zosima. He does discuss Ivan's rebellion, but does not give a theological response to Ivan's challenging of God and to his question about suffering and eternal harmony. Once again, close reading is necessary to make my argument tangible. Here I can give only a very concise account of my point. In *Dostojewski* Thurneysen quotes passages from Ivan's words, but lends them an entirely different emphasis. He also enlarges on Ivan's words in exactly the same tone, and gives thus the impression that the ideas of the character coincide with his own. In Thurneysen's account Ivan would talk about a wholly unfathomable God in a sort of theological-epistemological critique of the established Church and religion, resisting the tendency in religion and the Church to make the incomprehensible God comprehensible; Thurneysen's concern is to recognize the true God. In the novel, however, Ivan never intends to criticize the Church or religion for making the unknown God into a known god, nor is he concerned about forming a correct conception of God. He simply refuses to accept suffering; he is not interested in theological epistemology. At the same time Ivan's protest is an intellectual one too. As such this

protest remains irresolvable on earth. Thurneysen puts the emphasis on speaking about God: in his interpretation, suffering refers to an unknown resolution with an unknown God. In effect he turns a question into an answer. The question is whether this answer can resolve Ivan's protest.

Now in his additions to Barth's commentary Thurneysen does discuss the notion of eternal harmony, and proposes the reference to Ivan Karamazov in connection with Rom. 8:18 (and, in the letter, a reference to Starets Zosima). Barth takes this long insertion over practically verbatim, but does not mention Zosima. Thus, the reader gets a hermeneutical whole with Thurneysen's insertion, and an impression is created that the whole comment on Rom. 8:17–18 is caused by Ivan Karamazov's rebellion.

However, we need to be cautious about the adoption of Thurneysen's ideas in the context of *Römerbrief* II. On the one hand Barth mentions several characters, images²³ (and Dostoevsky himself) also independently of Thurneysen. This seems to be the case, as indicated, in Rom. 8:17. On the other hand, compared to Thurneysen's *Dostojewski*, his ideas assume a different accent in Barth's context.²⁴ For example, Barth does put Ivan's idea in the context of the problem of theodicy, where Thurneysen had turned it into an epistemological problem. Yet neither is theodicy Ivan's problem. Furthermore, in a way, Barth has appropriated Thurneysen's formulation which Thurneysen himself perhaps would not have published in this form ("Hier münden meine Zwischengedanken, die natürlich in der vorgebrachten Formulierung so nicht brauchbar sind"). This, incidentally, adds to the hermeneutical problem and deepens the point of mystification.

IV.2 Ivan Karamazov in Barth's Comment on Rom. 8:17–18

I will now concentrate on what happens with the character Ivan Karamazov in Barth's commentary on Rom. 8:17 and 18. My argument is that, taken out of his own context, Ivan Karamazov does not receive an answer to his rebellion, but is

²³ In doing so he (deliberately?) makes a small mistake: he implicitly refers to Ivan's image of 'the parallel lines which meet in infinity' as 'the parallel lines which never meet in finite reality'. (RII, 411)

²⁴ My theological criticism of early dialectical theology is grounded at length in Katya Tolstaya, *Kaleidoscope: F.M. Dostoevsky and the Early Dialectical Theology*, translator Anthony Runia (Leiden: Brill, 2013), forthcoming.

forced to offer an answer in the context of *Römerbrief* II. In *Römerbrief* II any human image of God or of eternal harmony is rejected, since all images are inadequate. The harmony of the true God supersedes our conceptions. In Rom. 8:18 Ivan's refusal to accept reconciliation in eternity is given a Trinitarian treatment. No comfort for suffering is possible unless inspired by the Holy Spirit.

What Barth in *Römerbrief* II fails to take into account is, firstly, that Ivan expresses his conception of God within the concrete context of the novel, where Ivan's world-view has the world-view of Starets Zosima as a counterpart; and, secondly, that he tells concrete stories of suffering. Barth in the commentary on Rom. 8:17 writes that someone who realizes the suffering and the insoluble mysteries of the world as fully and forcibly as Ivan Karamazov ("gehört und gesehen mit den Ohren und Augen des Iwan Karamasoff!") sees himself in relation to the world as an other, and thus invokes the true God. His God-forsakenness reveals the cry "Abba, Father!". The theodicy has now been accomplished ("die Theodizee [ist] vollzogen", RII, 412). Barth discusses an abstract person i.e. by using the impersonal constructions "wer ... der" ("wer das *einmal* gehört [...]," RII, 411) and wants to illustrate this abstract person by means of Ivan Karamazov. In doing so he abstracts from the concrete character and concentrates on the attitude of a rhetorical "someone" towards God in the midst of suffering. On the basis of this abstraction he arrives at a theodicy. The implication of Barth's procedure is that Ivan Karamazov also sees himself as God's child.

But the point is that in Dostoevsky's novel Ivan *refuses* to see himself as God's child. He refuses any comfort, nor does he utter the words "Abba, Father!" Ivan Karamazov does not see himself as an other, and he is the only one who perceives the world with *his* eyes and ears. This is characteristic of Dostoevsky's novels: impersonal constructions are unthinkable, and each expression or utterance is strictly that of the individual character.²⁵ Ivan does not accept the absolutely transcendent God, he rejects the harmony of God in the hereafter. Barth, who claims to understand this character existentially ("existentiell, will sagen ernsthaft," RII, 411), does not take him seriously in this. Thus, hermeneutically, Barth has not heard Ivan Karamazov in his context. The theological consequence is: the theodicy has not been accomplished.

This criticism, lapidary as it may appear, has a methodological-hermeneutical and theological foundation which I lack the space here to pursue. The example of Rom. 8:17–18 may, then, serve to illustrate three concluding points. First, the importance of the archival work: without research, the connections could not have been made visible. Second, the difficulty of assessing the status of

25 This is extensively discussed in my *Kaleidoscope*.

Thurneysen's additions (or rather, Barth's adoption of Thurneysen's suggestions) hermeneutically. And third, the deficiencies of early dialectical theology may be identified more clearly by involving Thurneysen's comments. Accordingly, any discourse on *Römerbrief* II should consult the correspondence between Barth and Thurneysen.

V Appendix. Thurneysen's documents listed

1. 28.10.1920.
2. 04.11.1920.
3. 05.11.1920. A short proposal to Rom. 1.
4. 09.11.1920. A short proposal to Rom 1:28–31.
5. 13.11.1920. A short comment on Rom. 2:1–13.
6. 19.11.1920. An extensive comment on Rom. 2:14–29.
7. 28.11.1920. An addition to Rom. 3:2ff.
8. 29.11.1920. (Postcard).
9. 03.12.1920. Rom. 3:21 is mentioned briefly.
10. 10.12.1920. Thurneysen writes that he is going to read Rom. 3:20ff. together with Rom. 3:27ff.
11. 13.12.1920. Some substantial additions to Rom. 3:21–28.
12. 14.12.1920.
13. 17.12.1920. (Postcard).
14. 08.01.1921.
15. 11.01.1921. Thurneysen has read the manuscript up to Rom. 4:5, and provides some additions to Rom. 3:31.
16. 15.01.1921. (Postcard).
17. 25.01.1921. A comment on Barth's translation from the Greek of Rom. 4:16–17a.
18. 26.01.1921. Thurneysen asks whether the end of Rom. 4 (from v. 18) is ready.
19. 28.01.1921. Thurneysen thanks Barth for his sound reasons for the translation from Greek of Rom. 4:16.²⁶
20. 08.02.1921. Thurneysen writes to have read Rom. 5:1–11 and proposes some changes and additions to 5:1 and 5:3–6.
21. 14.02.1921.
22. 21.02.1921. Thurneysen writes to have read Rom. 5:12–21 and proposes substantial corrections and additions.

²⁶ Cf. *BWL*, 462.

23. 28.02.1921. Thurneysen has read the proofs, (except for Rom. 5:12–21) and suggests an insertion to Rom. 3:9.
24. 05.03.1921.
25. 14.03.1921.
26. 16.03.1921.
27. 18.03.1921.
28. 21.03.1921. Thurneysen sends the proofs, which he has only partly corrected.
29. 29.03.1921.
30. An elaborate enclosure to Thurneysen's letter from 29.03.1921 with remarks to Rom. 6,1–11.
31. Single page with two corrections for Rom. 5:13 and Rom. 5:19, enclosed by Thurneysen's letter from 29.03.1921.
32. 05.04.1921.
33. No date, certainly before 21.04.1921.
34. 06.05.1921.
35. 17.05.1921.
36. 20.05.1921.
37. 25.05.1921 (Postcard).
38. No date.
39. 01.06.1921. Thurneysen announces his comments on Rom. 7 in the enclosure and writes that he will keep Rom. 8:1–10.
40. A substantial enclosure to Thurneysen's letter from 01.06.1921, on Rom. 7.
41. 02.06.1921.
42. 24.06.1921.
43. 01.07.1921. Substantial comments on Rom. 8.
44. 03.07.1921. Thurneysen writes to go through Rom. 8 again.
45. 08.07.1921. Thurneysen writes to bring along Rom. 9:1–13 next Sunday.
46. 22.07.1921.
47. 28.07.1921.
48. An elaborate enclosure to Thurneysen's letter from 28.07.1921, comments on Rom. 9:14–29.
49. 05.08.1921.
50. An elaborate enclosure to Thurneysen's letter from 05.08.1921, comments on Rom. 9:30–10,21.
51. 13.08.1921. Thurneysen announces an enclosure (Nr. 52 this list?) as being of minor importance.²⁷

27 "Das neue Manuskript, Röm. 11 ist glänzend geraten. Meine Anmerkungen sind ganz sekundärer Natur." The 'secondary' is striking considering the size of the enclosure.

52. An elaborate enclosure to Thurneysen's letter from 13.08.1921, comments on Rom. 11.
53. 24.08.1921. Comments on Rom. 11 and 12:1–2.²⁸
54. 25.08.1921. A short addition to Rom. 12:1–2.
55. 04.09.1921. (Postcard) Approves of Rom. 12,1–2.
56. 10.09.1921. (Postcard) Is working on manuscript (Rom. 13), galley's and paper proof.
57. No date. A number of short though relevant comments on Rom. 12:1–2; 12:21–13:7; 13:8–14.
58. A substantial enclosure to Thurneysen's undated letter, comments on the proofs Rom. 12:1–13:7.
59. 22.09.1921. Remarks on the final parts of the manuscript.
60. An enclosure to Thurneysen's letter from 22.09.1921 with comments on Rom. 14–15.
61. 24.09.1921. Some comments on 9:3 regarding the proofs.
62. 30.09.1921. Important comments on the "Preface" of the *Römerbrief* (see RII, XXXI–XXXIII).
63. 06.10.1921.
64. 18.10.1921. Short comments on the "Preface".
65. 22.10.1921. Short discussion about the "Preface" in discussion with Georg Merz' comments on it.
66. 05.11.1921. Sends proofs (Nr. 24 and 25).
67. 08.11.1921. Thurneysen sends back two proofs (Nr. 26 and 27), and provides a short insertion for Rom. 11:28.
68. 11.11.1921. (Postcard) Thurneysen promises to send Barth the proofs (Nr. 28, 29, 30).
69. 02.12.1921. Corrected final (?) proofs; expresses doubts concerning the "Preface".
70. 03.12.1921. (Postcard) Renounces his doubts on the "Preface".
71. 11.12.1921.
72. 15.12.1921.

28 "Der Schluss von Röm. 11 ist glänzend geraten und nicht minder erstaunlich und einleuchtend die mit höchster Um- und Einsicht gegebene, paradoxe Begründung, bez[iehungs]w.[eise] der Ethik auf Grund von [Röm.] 12,1–2. Ich habe diesen Teil gründlich durchforscht." KBA, with changes in *BW*, 515.